

ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 2617

Introduced by Assembly Member Blumenfield

February 24, 2012

An act to add Section 48070.7 to the Education Code, relating to pupil retention.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2617, as introduced, Blumenfield. Pupil retention: dropout recovery programs: funding report.

Existing law requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction, on or before August 1, 2011, and annually thereafter, to submit to the Governor, the Legislature, and the State Board of Education a report called the Annual Report on Dropouts in California. Existing law requires, among other things, that the report contain specified information on dropout rates, graduation rates, and pupil promotion rates. Existing law states the intent of the Legislature that the report be usable by schools, school districts, policymakers, researchers, parents, and the public, for purposes of identifying and understanding trends, causal relations, early warning indicators, and potential points of intervention to address the high rate of dropouts in California.

This bill would require, on or before May 31, 2013, the Superintendent, in cooperation with the state board and the Legislative Analyst's Office, to publish a report and recommendations addressing the adequacy of funding for dropout recovery programs in California, as specified.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.
State-mandated local program: no.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the
2 following:

3 (a) The National Governor’s Association Center for Best
4 Practices reviewed California and other state programs and
5 concluded that “States have largely focused on dropout prevention
6 because it is easier and cheaper to prevent students from leaving
7 school than to bring a dropout back to school. Yet, no matter how
8 effective a state’s dropout prevention efforts, students invariably
9 fall through the cracks.”

10 (b) The National Governor’s Association study further found
11 that quality alternatives to traditional comprehensive high schools
12 are lacking and that there are too few financial incentives for
13 dropout recovery.

14 (c) Research demonstrates that dropout recovery high schools
15 face added costs and a number of challenges in reengaging pupils,
16 including:

17 (1) Dropouts who reenter high school are significantly below
18 grade level.

19 (2) Reengagement into a high school setting can be difficult
20 and take a significant amount of time.

21 (3) Pupils typically have higher mobility and lower attendance
22 rates.

23 (4) Pupils who have dropped out are significantly more likely
24 to drop out again.

25 (d) Successful dropout recovery high schools utilize multiple
26 strategies including lower pupil-teacher ratios, state-of-the-art
27 technology, and career technical education to reach the variety of
28 learning modalities of the population that they serve.

29 (e) Incentives for dropout recovery programs would increase
30 the number of pupils served and could result in a significant return
31 on the state’s investment as evidenced by data from the Alliance
32 for Excellent Education.

33 SEC. 2. Section 48070.7 is added to the Education Code, to
34 read:

35 48070.7. On or before May 31, 2013, the Superintendent, in
36 cooperation with the state board and the Legislative Analyst’s
37 Office, shall examine the adequacy of funding for dropout recovery
38 programs in California and publish a report with recommendations.

1 In preparing the report, the Superintendent shall review dropout
2 recovery programs in other states, including, but not limited to,
3 the Texas Dropout Recovery Pilot Program, the Texas Optional
4 Flexible School Day Program, and the Arizona dropout recovery
5 programs authorized by Section 15-901.06 of the Arizona Revised
6 Statutes.

O